

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application and examined. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, and 19. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Nguyen for the telephonic interview regarding this application conducted on September 22, 2006. A Statement of the Substance of the Interview is being filed herewith.

THE CLAIMS

Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (incorrectly identified as 102(e) in the Office Action) as being unpatentable over Rawat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,340 ("Rawat") in view of Daswani et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023108) ("Daswani"). Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat in view of Maxwell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,589,290) ("Maxwell").

Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 17-20

Applicant submits that claim 5 is not made obvious by Rawat in view of Daswani and has amended claim 5 to further distinguish claim 5 from Rawat and Daswani. As amended, claim 5 specifically recites:

5. A computer-implemented method of processing electronic forms, the method comprising:

determining a first descriptor associated with a first field of a first electronic form;

determining first information entered in the first field on the first electronic form;

determining if user information stored for a user comprises an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor;

if the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, updating the user information whereby an identifier corresponding to the first

descriptor is included in the first information and the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor; and

if the user information comprises an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor,
updating the user information whereby the first information is associated with the identifier
corresponding to the first descriptor. (Applicant's claim 5, as amended, emphasis added)

Applicant submits that one of the inventive aspects of the invention recited in claim 5 is in the manner in which the "user information" is updated. As recited in claim 5, a determination is made if the user information stored for a user comprises an identifier corresponding to a first descriptor for a field in an electronic form. If it is determined that the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, then the user information is updated whereby an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is included in the user information and the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor. On the other hand, if the user information is determined to comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, then the user information is updated such that the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor. Applicant submits that such an "updating" feature is not disclosed or taught by Rawat or Daswani, considered individually or in combination.

In rejecting claim 5, the Examiner has acknowledged that Rawat does not specifically teach the "updating" feature recited in claim 5 (See Office Action dated May 30, 2006, page 4, 1st full paragraph). The Examiner however goes on to state that the "updating" is taught by Daswani in paragraphs 0052, 0053, and 0055 and Fig. 2 of Daswani. As described below, Applicant submits that Daswani fails to teach the "updating" feature recited in claim 5.

In the sections identified by the Examiner, Daswani teaches an "update module D" and "SW 39" for performing update procedures. Applicant however submits the processing performed in the updates described in Daswani is substantially different from the updating recited in claim 5. Firstly, as recited in claim 5, the updating of the user information is closely tied to and performed in response to determining whether or not the user information comprises an identifier corresponding to a first descriptor determined for a first field of an electronic form. Applicant submits that Daswani does not teach such a feature. Daswani

describes, in paragraphs 0052 and 0053, that "update module D" and "SW 39" may be used by a user to update user information such as user password, master password, web pages, corrections to generic personal data, etc. However, this does not teach anything about performing an update in response to a determination involving an identifier corresponding to a field descriptor for a field in an electronic form, as recited in claim 5.

Daswani further describes in paragraph 0052 that "SW 39 may also periodically navigate to the original WEB pages that are represented in a user's data block in database A and update them for content from a host server, including any form changes that may have been made since a last update". This section of Daswani appears to teach that the form updates are made using WEB pages of the forms. Applicant submits that this does not teach anything about determining a field descriptor associated with a field of the form and performing updates based upon whether or not the user information comprises an identifier corresponding to the field descriptor, as recited in claim 5.

Further, claim 5 specifically recites that if the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor, then the user information is updated whereby an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is included in the user information and the first information is associated with the identifier corresponding to the first descriptor. Accordingly, both an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor is added to the user information and the first information entered in the first field is associated with the identifier. Applicant submits that Daswani does not teach this feature recited in claim 5.

Daswani, in paragraphs 0052 and 0053, describes updating information stored in a user's block such as user password, master password, updating web page forms, address information, etc. Paragraph 0055 teaches how a form may be populated based upon values stored in the user data block. However, the updating described in these sections of Daswani does not involve adding an identifier corresponding to a first descriptor for an electronic form field to the user information and associating the first information entered in the first field of the electronic form with the identifier upon determining that the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the first descriptor.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that claim 5 is not anticipated by Daswani.

Further, Rawat does not cure the deficiencies of Daswani. As previously described, the Examiner has acknowledged that Rawat does not specifically teach the "updating" feature recited in claim 5 (See Office Action dated May 30, 2006, page 4, 1st full paragraph). Accordingly, even if Rawat and Daswani were combined as suggested by the Examiner (even though there appears to be no motivation for the combination), Applicant submits that the resultant combination would not make claim 5 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable over a combination of Rawat and Daswani.

Applicant submits that independent claims 11 and 17 are also patentable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 5, and others.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 6 and 19 that depend from claim 5, claims 12 and 20 that depend from claim 11, and claim 18 that depends from claim 17 are also patentable over Rawat and Daswani for at least a similar rationale as discussed for the allowability of the independent claims. The dependent claims are also patentable for additional reasons.

Claim 1-4, 7-10, and 13-16

Applicant submits that independent claim 1, as amended, is not made obvious by Rawat in view of Maxwell. One of the inventive aspects of the invention recited in claim 1 is the manner in which information stored for a user is updated based upon a form filled by a user. As amended, claim 1 recites:

identifying at least a second descriptor associated with a field in the first electronic form that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user;

determining a second value entered in the field associated with the second descriptor; and

updating the set of descriptors whereby including an identifier corresponding to the second descriptor is included in the set of identifiers stored for the user, wherein and the second value is associated with the identifier corresponding to the second descriptor. (Applicant's claim 1, in part, emphasis added)

As identified above, claim 1 recites an "updating" step in which the "set of descriptors" is updated to include a "second descriptor" associated with a field in the first electronic form and the second value entered in that form field is associated with the included identifier. Further, the "updating" step is performed by a computer since the preamble of claim 1 specifically recites a computer-implemented method of processing electronic forms, the method comprising several steps including the "updating" step. Applicant submits that Rawat or Maxwell, considered individually or in combination, does not teach such an "updating" step.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that including an identifier in the set of identifiers is taught by Rawat in col. 4 lines 27-42 and Fig. 1. Applicant submits that this section of Rawat describes conventional techniques for automatically filling forms that included analyzing fields of the forms and mapping them to the correct user data by parsing the HTML field names and then supplying the correct user data from a stored user profile (Rawat: col. 4 lines 30-35). This section of Rawat then goes on to describe problems associated with such conventional form-filling software because no naming convention existed for fields in an HTML form. As a result, the forms had to be mapped in advance and it was difficult to produce a fully automated form-filler application (Rawat: col. 4 lines 35-42). In col. 4 lines 43-62, Rawat describes a system for filling forms based upon visible field labels that are printed next to fields on a form. Accordingly, Applicant submits that col. 4 lines 27-42 and Fig. 1 of Rawat does not teach anything about updating a set of descriptors by including an identifier corresponding to a second descriptor (that is associated with the field on an electronic form) and associating a second value, that is entered in the field, with the included identifier, wherein the updating is performed by a computer. Applicant submits that mapping of forms is substantially different from updating a set of identifiers, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicant submits that Maxwell does not cure the deficiencies of Rawat. Maxwell teaches techniques for populating a form and is not concerned about updating a set of identifiers as recited in claim 1. In Maxwell, data receptacles (aka form fields) of a form are filled with data when the user executes a data population command. A form completion program obtains an image of the form to be filled and then searches for a template file that resembles the

form image to within a certain threshold. (Maxwell: Abstract; Summary) The form completion program utilizes the template file to identify what kind of data to insert into each of the form's data receptacles. Once the form completion program successfully identifies what kind of data to insert into each data receptacle the program begins to input appropriate kind of data into the appropriate data receptacle. (Maxwell: col. 14 lines 61).

The Office Action makes reference to Maxwell col. 14 lines 29-61. This section of Maxwell describes how a "template file" is used to identify what kind of data to insert into each form receptacle. This section does not teach anything about updating a "set of identifiers", as recited in claim 1.

Further, the "update operation" described in col. 17 lines 1-18 of Maxwell has nothing to do with updating a set of identifiers, as recited in claim 1. The "update operation" described in Maxwell is used for updating the version of the form completion program, which is substantially different from the updating recited in claim 1.

Based upon the above, Applicant submits that at least the "updating" feature recited in claim 1 is not taught by Rawat or Maxwell. Further, even if Rawat and Maxwell were combined as suggested by the Office Action (although there appears to be no motivation in the references for the combination), the resultant combination would not teach or suggest at least the "updating" feature recited in claim 1.

Applicant thus submits that claim 1 is patentable over a combination of Rawat and Maxwell.

Applicant submits that independent claims 7 and 13 are also patentable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 1, and others.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-4 that depend from claim 1, claims 8-10 that depend from claim 7, and claims 14-16 that depend from claim 13 are also patentable over Rawat and Maxwell for at least a similar rationale as discussed for the allowability of the independent claims. The dependent claims are also patentable for additional reasons.

Appl. No. 10/660,950
Amendment dated November 29, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2176

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



George B.F. Yee for Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:GBFY:mg